



CR-7082-2025

-1-

118

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

\*\*\*\*

**CR-7082-2025**

**Date of Decision: 01.10.2025**

Chandigarh Housing Board and others ..... Petitioners

Versus

Kamaladitya Construction Pvt. Ltd. .... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present: Mr. G.S. Wasu, Senior Standing Counsel with  
Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India challenging the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned Additional District Judge, Chandigarh in Execution Petition No.216 of 2024 praying that the same may kindly be modified to the extent of imposition of the condition of furnishing 100% security of the awarded amount in the shape of bank guarantee or FDR.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners filed an objection petition under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') against the award which is still pending and in the aforesaid petition, an application has also been filed for stay of execution proceedings in which the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 (Annexure P-5) has been passed whereby the operation of the impugned award has been stayed subject to the condition of furnishing of security in the shape of Bank Guarantee or FDR for the sum of ₹3,71,24,275/- by the petitioners. He further submitted that although petitioner No.1 is a Public Sector Undertaking,



CR-7082-2025

-2-

but the aforesaid order may be modified only to the extent that instead of the full amount, half of the amount be directed to be deposited.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners.

4. In the application filed by the petitioners under Section 36(2) of the Act for stay of the execution proceedings, the learned Additional District Judge, Chandigarh has stayed the award subject to the condition of furnishing the security in the shape of Bank Guarantee or FDR amount in the sum of ₹3,71,24,275/- by the petitioners. This Court is not able to find any ground or justification for intervention in its revisional jurisdiction since there is no perversity in the aforesaid order. So far as the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioners with regard to the modification of the impugned order (Annexure P-5) to the extent that instead of full amount, half of the amount be directed to be deposited is concerned, there is no justification for the same since the amount is only being secured and as per the impugned order, it is not to be disbursed to any of the parties. Therefore, there is no justification or any ground for reducing the aforesaid amount.

5. In view of the above, this Court does not find any perversity or illegality in the impugned order dated 22.08.2025 (Annexure P-5). Consequently, the present revision petition is hereby dismissed.

01.10.2025  
*Bhumika*

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)  
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No  
2. Whether reportable: Yes/No